DOCTOR STILLINGFLEET

Against Doctor

STILLINGFLEET;

OR, THE

PALPABLE CONTRADICTIONS

Committed by Him in charging

THE

ROMAN CHURCH

WITH

IDOLATRY,

Danger of SALVATION in Her Communion, Fanaticisme, and Divisions in matters of Faith.

De ore tuo te judico. Luc. 19. 22.

Printed in the Year, MDCLXXI.

Dr. *Stillingfleet* againſt Dr. *Stillingfleet*.

OR, THE

Palpable Contradictions Commited by Him, in charging the *Roman* Church with Idolatry, danger of ſalvation in her Communion, fanaticiſm and diviſions in matters of Faith.

De ore tuo te judico. Luc. 19. 22.

DR. *Stillingfleet*, as if he had commiſerated the condition, wherein *Roman* Catholicks are here in *England*, in order to the Printing of Polemical Debates; has been pleas'd to diſcharge them from all obligation of publiſhing any anſwer to the particular aſperſions, wherewith in ſeveral Books he beſpatters the *Roman* Church; having in a late Diſcourſe iſſued forth by him, ſo palpably contradicted, not only common Principles, but even his own, and other Proteſtant's Tenets; that hē has rendred all his diſcourſes againſt us void and of no force; for what credit is to be given to the teſtimony of one, who claſhes with his own ſentiments, and demoliſhes in one Treatiſe, what he eſtabliſhed in an other? Neither is any Man bound to ſolve, what is objected againſt him by a Witneſs, who is convinc'd of manifeſt perjury and plain contradiction, aſſerting what he denies, and denying what he aſſerts. My aim therefore in this ſhort Paper only is, to lay open the palpable contradictions of Dr. *Stillingfleet*, in imputing to the *Roman* Church the forementioned calumnies, running them over one by one according to this Method. 1. I ſhal in brief propoſe the accuſation, he forms againſt our Church. 2. I ſhal lay down ſome few Principles, either manifeſt of themſelvs, or at leaſt own'd by Dr. *Stillingfleet*

and his Partizans. 3. From these Principles, I shall in one or two Syllogisms, deduce the contradictory of the accusation fram'd against us. 4. I shal close up each Point with facing together the manifest contradictions committed by Dr. *Stillingfleet* in reference to the present aspersion.

Concerning Idolatry charged upon the *Roman* Church.

In his late Discourse, *chap.* 1. and 2. Dr. *Stillingfleet* is pleas'd to charge the *Roman* Church with manifest Idolatry, because she teaches *veneration of Images, adoration of Christ in the Eucharist, and invocation of Saints*; but that it may clearly appear how inconsistent this accusation is, with evident Principles, and with Doctor *Stillingfleet*'s own Maxims, I shal set down these following Propositions.

1. *'Tis an Article of Faith, and a Fundamental Point of Religion, that the honour, which is due only to God, is not to be given to a meer Creature*: This is manifest, for the main aim of Religion, the prime Precept of the divine Law, and the foundation of a good life consists in loving and reverencing God above all other things; which certainly is not perform'd by him, who gives as much honour and reverence to meer creatures, as to God.

2. *To teach Idolatry is to erre against the forementioned Article of Faith, and Fundamental Point of Religion*: This is also evident, because to teach Idolatry, is to teach, that the honour which is due only to God, may be given to a meer creature; which manifestly infringes the former Proposition.

3. *A Church, that does not erre against any Article of Faith, nor against any Fundamental Point of Religion, does not teach Idolatry*: This is evidently deduc'd from the two former Propositions; for, if she does not erre against any, she does not erre against the forementioned; and not erring against the forementioned Article and Fundamental Point, she does not teach Idolatry; for to teach Idolatry, is to erre against it.

4. *The Roman Church does teach veneration of Images, adoration of Christ in the Eucharist, and invocation of Saints*: This is not only granted by us, but also acknowledged by Dr. *Stillingfleet*, who fathers upon the *Roman* Church Idolatry, because she teaches the forementioned Doctrines.

5. *The Roman Church does not erre against any Article of Faith, nor against any Fundamental Point of Religion*: This is the common sentiment of Protestants, assented unto by Dr. *Stillingfleet* in several places of his *Rational Account*, see p. 54. where praising the moderation of the Church of *England*, in order to those Points, wherein she differs from the *Roman*; he says that *she requires subscription to them, not as Articles of Faith, but as inferiour truths*, affirming

this

this Doctrine to be *the ſenſe of the Church of England*, and quoting in confirmation thereof the Lord Primate of *Ireland*, who ſpeaking of the XXXIX. Articles, avers, that the Church of *England* does not *define any of theſe queſtions as neceſſary to be believ'd, either Neceſſitate Medii, or Neceſſitate Præcepti, neither do we look upon them as eſſential of ſaving faith, or legacies of Chriſt and his Apoſtles; but in a mean, as pious Opinions, — Neither do we oblige any man to believe them:* whence it follows, that according to this Doctrine, they are no Articles of divine faith, for all ſuch are *neceſſary to be believ'd* at leaſt, *Neceſſitate Præcepti*, and are *legacies of Chriſt and his Apoſtles*. Now ſeeing that Proteſtants do not ſay, that we erre in thoſe Points, wherein we agree with them, for that would be to accuſe themſelves of errors; they can only ſay, that we erre in thoſe Points, wherein we diſſent from them; and theſe Points being *no Articles of faith, nor neceſſary to be believ'd in order to ſalvation*, according to the ſenſe of the Church of *England*, expounded by Dr. *Stillingfleet* and his Partizans; it evidently follows, that according to their conceſſions the *Roman* Church does not erre againſt any *Article of Faith*, or any Point *neceſſary to Salvation*.

Moreover, ſeeing that the avoiding of all errors, damnable and deſtructive of ſalvation, is neceſſary to ſalvation, as is manifeſt: the *Roman* Church as not erring againſt any Point *neceſſary to ſalvation*, does not teach any error *damnable or deſtructive thereof*. Again, ſeeing that all fundamental and eſſential Points of Religion, are beyond debate *Articles of Faith*, nay the chief among them; if the *Roman* Church does not erre againſt any *Article of Faith*; neither does ſhe erre againſt *any Fundamental or eſſential point of Religion*: which is confirm'd from the common ſpeeches of Proteſtants, when they ſay, that our Church does not erre in *fundamentals*, but in *non-fundamentals*; not in the *foundation*, but in the *ſuperſtructures*; ſee more in the *Rational Account*, p. 1. *chap.* 2. concerning the Fundamentals of Religion, and the eſſentials of a true Church; whence is evidently concluded, that according to Dr. *Stillingfleet's* Principles, the *Roman* Church is abſolutely *a true Church*, as holding all fundamental and eſſential Points of Religion, not failing in any Article of Faith, nor in any thing neceſſary to ſalvation. Read alſo the ſame Book, *p.* 3. *chap.* 4. where he treats of the *poſſibility of ſalvation in the Roman Church*, granted by Proteſtants; and ſure no body can be ſav'd in the communion of a Church, that fails *in ſome thing neceſſary to ſalvation*. In the ſame Chapter Dr. *Stillingfleet* confeſſes, that it is the Doctrine of Arch-Biſhop *Laud*, and other Proteſtants, with whom he agrees, that the *Roman* Church is *a true way to ſalvation*, although *not a ſafe way*; that ſhe *holds the foundation*, that ſhe is the *very ſame Church with theirs*; which they uſe to anſwer when

they

they are urg'd to shew, where their Church was before *Luther's* and *Calvin's* time; for they say, that it was then, where it is now, *because their Church and ours is the very same*; which certainly they would never answer, were they perswaded, that our Church does fail *in any Article of Faith, or in any Fundamental and essential Point of Religion.* Finally, Dr. *Stillingfleet* in the Chapter lately mentioned, and in several other places, and Protestants commonly in their Books and Sermons, charge us with tiranny and uncharitablenes, because we impose more Articles of Faith necessary to be believ'd in order to salvation, than they do, and because we speak worse of their Church, than they do of ours: now this charge is frivolous, if they affirm that our Church errs against *Articles of Faith* and *Fundamental truths*, and that she fails even in *necessaries to salvation*; for 'tis manifest, that we do not speak any thing worse, than this, of their Church, and if they impose as an Article of Faith, the negative; where we impose the affirmative, or on the contrary; 'tis evident, that they impose as many Articles to be believ'd, as we do. If you desire to know more concerning Protestants doctrine in this Point, see the *Protestants Apology, Tract.* 1. *Sect.* 6. and *Tract* 2. *Chap.* 2. *Sect.* 14. where you shal find the forementioned Proposition to be own'd by the Champions of the pretended Reformation, affirming that the *Roman* Church and the Reformed do not make *a distinct Church*; that the *Roman* Church is *the Church of God, of the family of Christ, and a member of his visible Church*; that she does not teach any *error fundamental or destructive of salvation*; and they averre this to be *the judgment of all learned Protestants*, accusing the contrary party of their brethren of *an ignorant zeal*; and King *James* adds, that *they are worthy to be burnt.*

Out of these Propositions own'd by Dr. *Stillingfleet* and other Protestants, I argue thus, to clear the *Roman* Church from Idolatry, for teaching *veneration of Images, adoration of Christ in the Eucharist, and Invocation of Saints.*

A Church, that does not erre against any Article of Faith, or fundamental Point of Religion; does not teach Idolatry: See Propos. 3. *But the Roman Church is a Church, that does not erre against any Article of Faith, or fundamental Point of Religion*, See Propos. 3. *Ergo the Roman Church does not teach Idolatry:* ——*But she does teach veneration of Images, adoration of Christ in the Eucharist, and invocation of Saints*, See Propos. 4. *Ergo, neither veneration of Images, nor adoration of Christ in the Eucharist, nor invocation of Saints tanght by the Roman Church, is Idolatry*: which is point blanck against the aspersion of Idolatry layed upon us.

Hence manifestly appears, how Dr. *Stillingfleet* by charging the *Roman* Church with Idolatry, does most palpably contradict not only

the

the ſenſe of the Church of England, but alſo his own Tenets eſtabliſhed by him in his *Rational Account*; for what contradiction can be more palpable, than this, *viz. That the Roman Church does not erre againſt any fundamental Point, and yet that ſhe does teach Idolatry, which is to erre againſt a fundamental Point*; or thus, *That ſhe is a true Church, and the Church of Chriſt, and yet that ſhe is an idolatrous Church*; might he not ſay as well, *ſhe is a true Church, but ſhe is not a true Church*!

Concerning danger of ſalvation, objected againſt thoſe, who communicate with the *Roman* Church.

In the *Third* Chapter of the ſame Diſcourſe, Dr. *Stillingfleet* charges the *Roman* Church *with dangerous Doctrines in order to Salvation*, affirming that thoſe, who live in her Communion, are in great danger of being damn'd. Now I conceive, this objection of Dr. *Stillingfleet*, is not to be underſtood of that danger of damnation, which attends all men, as long as they are in this life, let them be of never ſo pure a Religion, for the true way to Heaven is narrow and difficult, beſet with ſeveral dangers and temptations; and many overcom'd by them, either quit it, or do not follow its conduct: and 'tis very unreaſonable to blame our Church for that, which attends the moſt pure Church of the world, whatſoever he thinks that Church to be. Neither can it be underſtood of thoſe, who although once *Roman* Catholicks, yet afterwards became zealous Proteſtants; for to theſe Dr. *Stillingfleet* will not deny the ſecurity, he grants to other Proteſtants. Finally, Neither can it be underſtood of thoſe, who although they profeſs themſelves to be members of the *Roman* Church, yet do not conform to her Doctrine; for alſo thoſe who are of the pureſt Church, in Dr. *Stillingfleet's* Opinion, if they conform not to her Laws and Doctrines, are in danger of being damn'd: nay, let the Doctrines of our Church be as dangerous, as our adverſaries can make them, yet if one conforms not to them, he will never run hazard of being damn'd upon their account. Wherefore the objection of Dr. *Stillingfleet* is to be underſtood in this ſenſe, *viz.* That *who lives and dies in the communion of the Roman Church, having conform'd to her Doctrine, is in great danger, and probability of being damn'd.* But how repugnant this objection is, even with his own and other Proteſtants conceſſions, and with manifeſt Principles; will appear by theſe few Poſitions.

1. *Whoever is in a condition, wherein he is certainly ſav'd, he is in no danger or probability of being damn'd*: This is evident, for ſuch an one is paſt all danger of being damn'd, and who is paſt all danger, is in no danger; moreover certainty excludes all danger in the ſame kind; nay otherwiſe ſuppoſing that one has dy'd in the grace of God, and that he is in Heaven, we might ſay, that yet he is in danger of being damn'd.

2. *Whoever lives and dies in a true way to salvation, having conform'd to its directions, or whoever has done all that was necessary to attain unto salvation, is in a condition, wherein he is certainly sav'd:* This is also undeniable, for how is it possible, that such a way be a true way to salvation, if one who has kept always to it, following its conduct, comes to be damn'd! Or, how also is it possible, that one be damn'd, unless he fails in some thing necessary for to be sav'd?

3. *The Roman Church is a true way to salvation, and teaches all things necessary to attain unto it:* This is granted by Dr. *Stillingfleet* and other Protestants, who confess our Church to be *a true Church, the same with theirs*, and a *true way to Heaven*; see what has been alleag'd above in confirmation of the 3. Proposition.

4. *Whoever lives and dies in the communion of the Roman Church, having conform'd to her Doctrine; lives and dies in a true way to salvation, having conform'd to its directions; and has done all that was necessary to attain unto it:* This is evidently deduc'd from the former Position; for who lives and dies in the communion of the *Roman* Church, which is a true way to salvation; and conforms to her Doctrine, which contains all necessaries to attain unto it; must needs live and die in a true way to salvation, having conform'd to its directions; and have done all that was necessary to attain unto it.

Out of these Positions, assented unto by Dr. *Stillingfleet*, I argue thus to secure these, who live and die in the communion of the *Roman* Church, having conform'd to her Doctrine, from all danger of being damn'd.

Whoever is in a condition wherein he is certainly sav'd, he is in no danger of being damn'd: See Posit. 1 *But whoever lives and dies in a true way to salvation, having conformed to its directions, is in such a condition;* See Posit. 2. *Ergo, whoever lives and dies in a true way to salvation, having conform'd to its directions, is in no danger of being damn'd.* —— *But whoever lives and dies in the communion of the Roman Church, having conform'd to her Doctrine; lives and dies in a true way to salvation, having conform'd to its directions;* See Posit. 4. *Ergo, whoever lives and dies in the communion of the Roman Church, having conform'd to her Doctrine; is in no danger of being damn'd.*

Again, *Whoever has done all that was necessary to attain unto salvation; is in a condition, wherein he is certainly sav'd;* See Posit. 2. *But whoever lives and dies in the communion of the Roman Church, having conform'd to her Doctrine; has done all that was necessary to attain unto salvation;* See Posit. 4. *Ergo, whoever lives and dies in the communion of the Roman Church, having conform'd to her Doctrine; is in a condition, wherein he is certainly sav'd:* and consequently according to the 1. Posit. is in no danger of being damn'd; whence is evidently concluded, that the Doctrines of the *Roman* Church are

not dangerous of themselvs to salvation; for if they were, without question whoever had liv'd and dy'd conforming to them, would be in danger of being damn'd.

Hence are discovered other palpable contradictions of Dr. *Still.* comparing what he says, in this aspersion lay'd upon us, with what he grants in other places quoted above, *Prop.* 5. for on the one side he grants that the *Roman* Church is a true way to salvation, and consequently who keeps to it, conforming to its Doctrine; will certainly be sav'd: on the other side he says, that who keeps to it, conforming to its Doctrine, is in danger of being damn'd; and consequently will not certainly be sav'd. On the one side he grants, that the *Roman* Church teaches all things necessary to salvation; and consequently who does what she teaches, will certainly be sav'd; on the other side he says, that if one does what she teaches, he will not certainly be sav'd; nay he will certainly be damn'd, no less, than who perseveres an Adulterer, or an Idolater; and consequently she does not teach all things necessary to salvation. So that he comes to grant, that the *Roman* Church is and is not a true way to salvation; that she does, and does not teach all things necessary to attain unto it; that who conforms to her Doctrine, will certainly and will not certainly be sav'd; nay will certainly be sav'd, and will certainly be damn'd: Are not these contrarieties, or contradictions?

Neither can he say with truth, that he does not grant a greater possibility of salvation to one in the *Roman* Church, than to one *in wilful sin*, viz. Adultery, *because he may repent of it*, as he says in his late Discourse, *p* 53. 1. Because sure he will not grant adultery to be a true way to Heaven, yet he grants this of the *Roman* Church in the places quoted above. 2. Because without doubt he grants more to us in order to salvation, than to *Jews* or *Pagans*; for he confesses that we do not erre against *any Article of Faith*, that we are of *the same Church with Protestants*, that we hold *no damnable error*; which certainly he will not grant of *Jews* and *Pagans*; yet he cannot deny, but that *Jews* and *Pagans* may also be sav'd, if they repent. 3. Because he grants a greater capacity of salvation to *Roman* Catholicks, than they do to Protestants; otherwise why does he complain of their uncharitablenes! yet 'tis certain, no Catholick denies a possibility of salvation to Protestants, if they repent of their errors. 4. Because Arch-Bishop *Laud*, whom he defends, grants to *Roman* Catholicks a capacity of salvation, which is question'd by other Protestants, see the *Rational Account*, p. 612. yet no Protestant questions, but that a *Roman* Catholick may be sav'd, if he repents. *Finally*, To say that the *Roman* Church is a true way to salvation, and that you may be sav'd in her communion; if you repent and quit her communion; is as much as to say in plain *En-*

gliſh, that you may be ſav'd in the *Roman* Church, if you go out of it; and that it is a true way to Heaven, but that it will never carry you thither, unleſs you leave it, and take an other way: which is a pretty piece of pure nonſenſe.

Neither again can he in prudence ſay, that thoſe only may be ſav'd in the *Roman* Church; who either out of invincible ignorance go on that way, without knowing what they do, as he intimates in the ſame Page; or although they profeſs themſelves to be of the *Roman* Church, yet do not follow her Doctrine, but deteſt thoſe Tenets, which diſtinguiſh Catholicks from Proteſtants. 1. Becauſe although one, who has committed Adultery out of invincible ignorance, may be ſav'd; yet no body will ſay, that Adultery is a true way to Heaven; as he ſays the *Roman* Religion is. 2. 'Tis a ſtrange fancy to affirm, that the *Roman* Church is really a true way to Heaven; yet thoſe who follow it, underſtanding which way they go, will never come thither; but thoſe only, who follow it, not underſtanding what way, they have taken: which is as if he had affirm'd, that ſuch a way is the true way to *Oxford*; yet if you do not wink, but open your eys, although you conſtantly follow it; 'twil never bring you thither, but to a quite oppoſite place. *Finally*, To aver, that one who profeſſes himſelf of the *Roman* Church, which is a true way to ſalvation, yet if he follows her conduct, and does not deteſt her Doctrine, will never be ſav'd; 'tis, as if he ſhould aver, that although one be in a true way to Heaven, yet if he follows it, he will never arrive thither; or that he who knowingly profeſſes himſelf a *Roman* Catholick, will never be ſav'd, unleſs he be a hypocrite, thinking one thing, and profeſſing an other, *i. e.* unleſs he goes the plain way to Hell, he will never go to Heaven: Is not this an other excellent piece of nonſenſe and contradiction?

Concerning Fanaticiſme fathered upon the *Roman* Church.

In the aſperſion of Idolatry, Dr. *Stillingfleet* has many of his own Church againſt him; in the aſperſion of Fanaticiſme, he has none of his own Church for him; for he ſeems the firſt, who has lay'd this charge upon the *Roman* Church, in the 4. *Chap.* of his late Diſcourſe: but how much he contradicts therein, not only manifeſt reaſon, but alſo his own ſentiments, will evidently appear to whoever ſhal peruſe theſe few Conſiderations.

1. *Fanaticiſme does neceſſarily contain a reſiſtence againſt authority.* This is manifeſt from the common notion of Fanaticiſme, for no body judges that to be Fanaticiſme, which is not grounded upon a private ſpirit and judgment contrary to Authority: nay Dr. *Stilling.* confeſſes the ſame in the preſent Diſcourſe, *p.* 241. defining Fanaticiſme in theſe words, *By Fanaticiſme we underſtand, either an enthuſiaſtick way of Religion, or reſiſting Authority under pretence of Religion.*

2. No

2. *No particular ways of Religion countenanced by a competent Authority, are Fanaticiſme:* This follows from the former Conſideration; for ſuch ways of Religion want ſome thing eſſential to Fanaticiſme, viz. *a reſiſtence againſt Authority*, for what is according to Authority, is not againſt it; nay what is warranted by Authority, is not grounded upon a meer private ſpirit, as Fanaticiſme muſt be. Moreover, otherwiſe all the particular manners of preaching or praying practiſed by the Prophets, and all their extraordinary Viſions and Revelations, would be flat Fanaticiſme; but becauſe they were countenanced by a competent Authority, they could not deſerve that character. And I am confident that Dr. *Still.* might produce out of the *Canticles*, the *Revelations* of S. *John*, *Ezechiel*, and other Prophets, and out of other Books of Scripture; as ſtrange and extraordinary expreſſions, and practiſes, as any he alleages out of the Revelations of S. *Brigit*, and Mother *Juliana*, or out of the lives of the founders of religious Orders approv'd by the *Roman* Church; and the ſame topicks, wherewith Dr. *Still.* would evidence againſt a *Pagan*, that the ancient Prophets were guided by God in their particular ways; do prove againſt him, although not in the ſame degree, that the forementioned founders were goverred by a good ſpirit in framing their particular inſtitutes. Whence I conclude, that although an expreſſion or practiſe ſeems extravagant and alien from the vulgar faſhion, yet if it be warranted by competent Authority; it ought not to be characteriz'd for Fanaticiſme.

3. *The Authority competent to clear particular ways and practiſes from Fanaticiſme, is not neceſſarily divine:* This is evident, for otherwiſe all particular ways and practiſes, either civil or eccleſiaſtical, (for there may be fanaticiſme, as well in civil, as in eccleſiaſtical affairs,) as for inſtance, all particular inſtitutes of the Inns of Court, and of other Colledges, which contain ſeveral extravagancies, the Inſtalments of Knights, Magiſtrates, and other Officers; the peculiar Ceremonies of the Church of *England*, either in the habit of her Clergy, or in the formalities of her Divine Service (which other Congregations deem ſuperſtitions,) and many other extravagant cuſtoms warranted only by humane Authority, would be plain Fanaticiſme.

4. *All particular ways of Religion, or of ſerving God, countenanced by the Authority of a true Church, are countenanced by a competent Authority:* which may be underſtood, whither the Church be infallible, as we ſay, ours is; or fallible, as Proteſtants ſay, theirs, and all other Churches are. This ſeems alſo unqueſtionable; for what can a true Church warrant, if ſhe cannot warrant particular rules, tending to piety, devotion, and the ſervice of God? And as the Authority of a Common-wealth is ſufficient to clear particular civil for-

malities from fanaticiſme, ſo the Authority of a true Church does ſuffice to free particular religious demeanours from the like aſperſion. Nay, ſhould the Church of *England* approve the extravagant proceedings of thoſe, which ſhe ſtiles fanaticks; no body, who owns that Church to be true, would term them fanaticiſme; which proves that they are perſwaded, that the Authority of a true Church is ſufficient to clear an action from Fanaticiſme.

5. *All religious orders and practiſes of devotion countenanced by the authority of the Roman Church, are particular ways of religion, or of ſerving God, countenanced by the authority of a true Church:* This cannot be deny'd by Dr. *Still.* and his Partizans, who in the places above mentioned, confeſs the *Roman* Church to be a true Church; and in this diſcourſe of Fanaticiſme, he affirms, that the religious orders and particular practiſes of devotion, whereof he makes mention, are countenanced by the authority of the *Roman* Church, pretending upon that account to charge her with fanaticiſme, ſee *p.* 241.

6. *A Church, that does not leave every one to be his own Judg concerning matters of Faith, and the right interpretation of Scripture; but obliges all to ſubmit to her judgment; does not allow fanaticiſme:* This is evident from the notion of Fanaticiſme expounded, Conſ. 1. and 2. for Fanaticiſme is bottomed upon the private ſpirit of each man interpreting Scripture according to his own reaſon, without being oblig'd to ſubmit to the definitions of any Church.

7. *The Roman Church does not leave every one to be his own Judg concerning matters of Faith, and the right interpretation of Scripture, but obliges all to ſubmit to her judgment:* Upon the truth of this aſſertion is grounded Dr. *Stillingfleet's* eternal complaint of the tiranny of the *Roman* Church, (as he is pleas'd to ſtile it) for not leaving every one to be his own Judg in matters of faith; and at this Doctrine he has a glance almoſt in every Page of his *Rational Account.*

Out of theſe Conſiderations, which cannot be deny'd by Dr. *Stillingfleet*, I argue thus, to clear the *Roman* Church, and all religious orders, and particular practiſes of devotion, approv'd by her authority; from the aſperſion of Fanaticiſme.

No particular ways of Religion countenanced by a competent authority, are fanaticiſme; ſee Conſ. 2. *But all particular ways of Religion countenanced by the authority of a true Church, are countenanced by a competent authority*; ſee Conſ. 4. *Ergo no particular ways of religion countenanced by the authority of a true Church, are fanaticiſme: but all religious orders, and particular practiſes of devotion countenanced by the authority of the Roman Church, are particular ways of religion countenanced by the authority of a true Church*; ſee Conſ. 5. *Ergo, they are not fanaticiſme.*

Again,

Again, *A Church that does not leave every one to be his own Judg concerning matters of faith, and the right interpretation of Scripture, but obliges all to ſubmit to her judgment; does not allow fanaticiſme*; ſee Conſ. 6. *But the Roman Church is ſuch a Church*, ſee Conſ. 7. *Ergo, ſhe does not allow fanaticiſme*; which is quite contrary to the calumny, he lays upon her.

Hence may be gathered many other palpable contradictions; for on the one ſide he grants, that the religious orders, and particular practiſes of devotion, he makes mention of, are according to authority, as being countenanced by the authority of a true Church; and conſequently that they are not grounded upon fanaticiſme, which muſt be againſt authority: On the other ſide he ſays, that they are grounded upon fanaticiſme, and conſequently are not according to authority, but againſt it; which is eſſential to fanaticiſme. On the one ſide he grants that the *Roman* Church does not leave any one to be his own judg in matters of religion, and conſequently does not allow fanaticiſme; that being point blanck againſt its eſſence: on the other ſide he ſays, that ſhe does allow fanaticiſme, and conſequently does leave every one to be his own judg in matters of religion, this being a neceſſary ingredient of fanaticiſme: Is not this palpably to contradict himſelf?

I verily believe, that Dr. *Stillingfleet*, did his intereſt byaſs him that way, could with *Lucian*, *Porphyrius*, and thoſe many libertines of our Country, the ſpawn of ſuch Books, as theſe, he could, I ſay, flurt with as much piquancy and railery, at Chriſtian Religion, as he does at the *Roman*, charging Chriſtians with ſuperſtitions, corruptions, and diſſentions. For if it be a rational way of proceeding, to rally together whatever has been objected by the enemies of a community, without making mention of the anſwers given by them, or of the ſentence pronounced in their favour; and to father upon the whole body the miſdemeanours of ſome members, although diſown'd by the Major part, (which are the artifices us'd by Dr. *Still.* in his works againſt Catholicks;) what community is there ſo holy, which may not eaſily be traduc'd? But this Doctor is ſo unfortunate, as well in vindicating the Proteſtant, as in attacking the *Roman* Church; that he neither produces any thing in vindication of Proteſtancy, but the ſame or the like may be alleag'd in defence of Socinianiſme, and other Hereſies, condemn'd as ſuch by Proteſtants, ſee *The Guide in Controverſies*, Diſc. 4. nor oppoſes any thing againſt the *Roman* Religon; but the ſame or the like may be objected by *Jews*, or *Pagans* againſt the Chriſtian, which according to Scripture is a ſcandal to the former, and a deriſion to the latter: ſo that whoever will pleaſe to reflect ſeriouſly upon his Diſcourſes; he may clearly ſee, that his proofs for Proteſtancy, will as ſoon make one a Socinian,

Socinian, as a Protestant; and his Objections against Catholicks, will as soon make one no Christian, as no Catholick.

Concerning Divisions urg'd against the *Roman* Church.

After Fanaticisme, he charges the *Roman* Church in the next place, *Chap.* 5. with Divisions and Dissentions. We do not deny, but that among *Roman* Catholicks happen several contests concerning Politick affairs, and many hot debates about meer scholastick niceties; but such differences are not to be stil'd *Divisions of the Roman Church*, no more than meer suits at law, which happen among Protestants, are to be term'd so many Sects and Divisions of the Protestant Church. Moreover we do confess, that in matters of faith (whereof Dr. *Stillingfleet* must needs speak, if he will speak to the purpose) there are many Divisions from the *Roman* Church; such are all heresies and schismes. Wherefore this objection of Dr. *Stillingfleet* must be understood, as even he himself insinuates, concerning Divisions in matters and articles of faith, but that you may discover the incoherency of this calumny with his own Principles; be pleas'd to read over these few Points.

1. *No Divisions from the Roman Church are Divisions of the Roman Church:* This is manifest, for Divisions of a Church, happen only, when both Parties remain Members of that Church; but Divisions from a Church, are between those who cease to be members, and those which remain members of that Church: wherefore as it is impossible for those, who cease to be members of a Church, to remain members therof; so 'tis impossible that divisions from a Church, should be divisions of that Church.

2. *All Divisions in matters and articles of faith, are divisions from the true Church, and from all her members:* This is also evident, for all divisions in articles of Faith, do necessarily imply heresie, on the one or the other side; and heresie, as its notion and the very word do evidence, is a division and separation from the true Church, and all her Members.

3. *All Divisions in matters of Faith, are Divisions from the Roman Church:* This cannot be questioned by Dr. *Still.* and his followers, who confess the *Roman* Church to be a Member of the true Church, see above Propos. 5. wherefore if all divisions in matters of faith are divisions from the true Church, and all her members, Point. 2. It is evidently concluded, that they must also be divisions from the *Roman* Church.

4. *All those who assent to the antient Creeds, are according to Dr.* Stillingfleet's *Opinion undivided in matters and articles of faith:* see his *Rational Account*, p. 56. where he says that nothing is to be look't upon as an article of faith, necessary to be believ'd in order to salvation, and to the being of a Church (the same he intimates in his

his late Discourse, *p.* 52.) *which was not admitted into the ancient Creeds*; and for this reason he will have them call'd *Summaries of Faith.* Nay, p. 98. he affirms that the Apostolick Creed *contains the Fundamentals of Christian communion*; whence it follows, that according to Dr. *Still.* all those who agree to the ancient Creeds are of the same Communion, and undivided in matters of faith.

5. *All Roman Catholicks assent to the ancient Creeds*; this is unquestionable, as wel from experience, as from the concessions of our adversaries; otherwise *Roman* Catholicks, as failing in some thing necessary to the being of a true Church, (such are the substantial Points contain'd in these Creeds, especially the Apostolical) would not be members of the Catholick Church; which Dr. *Stilingfleet* wil not aver.

From these Points agreed unto by Dr. *Stillingfleet*, and other Protestants, I argue thus, to clear the *Roman* Church from divisions in matters of faith.

No divisions from the Roman Church, are divisions of the Roman Church, see Point. 2. *But all divisions in matters of faith are divisions from the Roman Church*, see Point. 3. *Ergo, no divisions in matters of faith are divisons of the Roman Church*; and consequently she is unjustly endited by Dr. *Still.* for divisions in matters of faith.

Again, *All those who assent unto the ancient Creeds, are undivided in matters of faith*, see Point. 4. *But all Roman Catholicks assent unto the ancient Creeds*, see Point. 5. *Ergo, all Roman Catholicks are undivided in matters of faith:* and consequently 'tis a calumny cast upon us by Dr. *Still.* to say that we are divided in such matters.

Hence are laid open other palpable contradictions committed by Dr. *Still.* for on the one side he grants, that all divisions in matters of faith, are divisions not of, but from the true Church and all her Members, and consequently from the *Roman*, which he confesses to be a Member of the true Church; and that all such divisions are between Members and not Members of the true Church; on the other side he affirms that there are divisions of our Church in matters of faith, and consequently that they are not divisons from our Church, nor between Members, and not Members; but between Members and Members of her Communion: on the other side he grants, that we assent to the ancient Creeds, and consequently according to his Principles, we are undivided in matters of faith: on the other side he says, that we are divided in matters of faith, and consequently according to his Maximes, we do not assent unto the ancient Creeds. Does not Dr *Still.* who swallows so many Propositions so opposite one to an other, seem wholly possest with the spirit of contradiction?

I might glean up several other contradictions couch'd in this discourse

course of Dr. *Stillingfleet*, either compar'd with it *self*, or with other works of the same Author; but I have contented my self with picking out these, as most material to the main aspersions and calumnies cast by him upon the *Roman* Church. And this alone may suffice to annul, whatever he has hitherto, or shal hereafter object against us; for a witness who has been once palpably convinc'd to have forsworn or contradicted himself in matters of Moment, besides the condigne punishment he is lyable unto; he does vacate all evidences produc'd by him, against his adversary, and deserves never more to be heard against him in any tribunal. Notwithstanding other more learned Pens (unless the extraordinary solicitude us'd for the suppression of Catholick Books prevent their endeavours,) will afford him a more particular and compleat answer, destroying and shivering into pieces all his Objections; for me, 'tis enough in a sheet and a half to have compell'd him to be his own Executioner, and to make havock of his Arguments with his own Weapon.

I close up with entreating from Dr. *Still.* if I may be so bold, some few favours, which may prove very beneficial, as well for his own, as for our satisfaction. 1. That, seeing he carries so great a bogue, and does not fear our Writers, he would obtain publick Licence for Catholicks to Write and Print against him: for to boast as he does, that no Answers are published against his Books, and that we have no men of learning among us; whenas all possible efforts are us'd, (wherein probably Dr. *Still.* has a hand,) that no Answers be published against them, and that our Doctors have no occasion to shew their learning; is, as if he should challenge his adversary into the Field, boasting that he has no courage; and yet use all his interest, that the Door be kept lockt upon him, and that by no means he be let out; whereas his adversary on the contrary uses all his artifices for to get out, and to duel him. 2. That he would read over the few Tracts, which by great chance have been issued forth against him; for he never seems to have read, either *The Guide in Controversies*, otherwise he would at least have attempted to have answered it, in vindication of his own, and his Arch-Bishop's honor, who are particularly nam'd in the Title; or, *Protestancy without Principles*, otherwise in lieu of answering it, he would not have confirm'd the main intent thereof, which was to shew that Protestancy as Protestancy has no better Principles, than Arrianisme, or other Hereses; for the Principles, Dr. *Stillingfleet* lays down at the end of this discourse in answer to that Book, are common, as is manifest, to all Hereticks. 3. That if he has leisure to give an answer to this short Paper, he would be pleas'd for once to write Controversies, not Play-Books; treating seriously matters of so great concern, and laying aside drollery, slurs, and gay expressions, the com-

mon

mon dreſs of Hereſies; and that he would ingenuouſly tell us, which of the premiſes in each of the forementioned ſyllogiſmes, he does deny; for they being granted, ſure he will not deny the conſequences. *Finally*, That he would not think it a ſatisfactory anſwer to a Book, only to call it, *a Woolſack*, *a Fly*, or *a Rat*, expreſſions us'd by him; for this would be to open us a very eaſie way of anſwering all his Works: only call his *Rational Account*, a Woolſack; his Late Diſcourſe, a Fly; and his other Books, Rats; and in Doctor *Stillingfleet's* phraſe, you have anſwered them all.

By *John Williams*.

C AN

AN APPENDIX IN CONFIRMATION Of the Former DISCOURSE.

Wherein Doctor STILLINGFLEET Is prov'd an IDOLATER out of his own CONCESSIONS.

TO the end it may manifestly appear, that the calumnies laid upon Catholicks by Dr. *Stillingfleet*, are not only against his Principles, but also against his Person; and that he cares not how much he bedaubs himself, so that he may cast dirt at the *Roman* Church: I shal demonstrate in this brief Appendix, that according to his own Maximes and Concessions, he is an Idolater: To this effect I set down these following Propositions owned by Him.

1. *Whoever represents God not as he is, but in a way far inferiour to his greatness, or worships him so represented; is an Idolater* Upon this Principle Dr. *Still.* grounds the crime of Idolatry, which he

 pretends

pretends to fasten upon the *Roman* Church, because she teaches veneration of Images; see his late Discourse, from *p.* 62. to 78. where he endeavours to prove at large, that it is prohibited in the Second Commandement, according to Protestants account; to make any representation or similitude of God with respect to his worship; because Scripture and natural reason tels us, that God's nature being *infinite and incomprehensible*, could *not be represented unto men, but in a way, that must be an infinite disparagement unto it:* which words being general, compreheud all *unfitable* and *incongruous representations* of the Deity; whence is concluded, that according to Dr. *Stillingfleet's* sentiment, 'tis Idolatry prohibited by the Law of Nature, and by their Second Commandement *to represent God in a way far beneath his greatness, or to worship and adore him so represented:* This Doctrine he pretends to establish in the places above mentioned, out of Scripture, out of ancient Fathers, and out of the practise of the wiser sort of Heathens.

2. *God is represented unto men in this life, without the beatifical vision, not as he is, but in a way far inferiour to his greatness; whither he be represented unto them, by Images, by Words, or by their own imaginations:* This is manifest, for God being not only a Spirit, but also ineffable, and incomprehensible; as he cannot be represented, as he is, by a corporeal Image, because he is a Spirit; so neither can he be represented as he is, by words, because he is ineffable; nor by humane thoughts or imperfect imaginations, because he is incomprehensible. The knowledg and idea we frame of God in this life, as the Scripture tels us, is an *ænigmatick* and abstractive knowledg, made by *species* far estranged from his Majesty: and if the heart of man cannot conceive the glory, which is prepar'd in Heaven for the bodies of the elect; How can it be able to form a worthy conception of the Deity? Beyond debate there are as many unhandsome representations fram'd by men of God, in words and imaginations, as in Images. Moreover, no words are fitter to declare unto us the Deity and its attributes, than those of Scripture, as being Penn'd by the Prophets and Evangelists, and dictated by the Holy Ghost; notwithstanding even in Scripture God is represented not as he is, but in a way far beneath his greatnels; for he is represented there with a right hand, with a face, with arms, with anger and other passions, sometimes sitting, sometimes walking: whereas God neither has a right hand, nor a face, nor arms, nor any passion; neither does he sit, nor walk: and 'tis as obnoxious to the mistakes of ignorant People, to represent God unto them in a way far inferiour to his greatnels and worth, by words, as by Images. Wherefore seeing that God may be misrepresented unto men, either of these three ways, whether it be by *Images*, or by *Imaginations*,

or

or by *words*, is not material: and if according to the dictates of nature, as Dr. *Stillingfleet* will needs have it, 'tis idolatrous and dishonourable unto God to represent him by Images, or to worship him so represented; because Images represent God in a way far beneath his greatness: Upon the same account 'twil be idolatrous and dishonorable to God to represent him either by words, or by our gross imaginations, or to adore him so represented, because all such representations fall short of his infinite Majesty: Besides Dr. *Still.* p. 59. understands the prohibition contain'd in this Commandement, of all kind of *similitudes* or representations whatsoever, *whither of a real or imaginary being*; and not only corporeal Images, but also words and thoughts are certain kinds of representations and resemblances of their objects; and should one adore the thought or idea, which he frames of God, for God; he would commit Idolatry and infringe this Commandement, no less, than if he should adore the corporeal Image of God, for God; supposing that all such representations come short, as certainly they do, of God's infinite worth and Majesty. *Finally*, As many testimonies might be produc'd out of Scripture and ancient Fathers to prove the *unsuitableness* and *incongruity* of our thoughts and words with the incomprehensible and ineffable nature of God; as Dr. *Stillingfleet* alleages here to evidence the same of corporeal Images. Whence I conclude, that according to this Doctrine of Dr. *Still.* if it be Idolatry to make any Image of God, or to worship him represented by it; 'tis also Idolatry to frame any idea of God, or to pronounce any words signifying his nature; or to worship him represented by them; nay, the words of the Law, if they be taken, as they sound, are more suitable to the forming an idea of God, than to the making an image of God; for who frames an idea of God, *makes unto himself* a resemblance of God, to adore him thereby; but the Artificer, who makes an Image of God, may more properly be said rather to make unto others, than unto himself, the likenes of God.

3. *Whoever worships God represented unto him in this life, without the beatifical vision, either by Images, by Words, or by Imaginations; he worships God represented not as he is, but in a way far inferiour to his greatness:* This is evidently deduc'd from what has been already said; for if God be represented by all these three manners, in a way far beneath his greatness, as certainly he is; whoever worships God represented unto him in either of these three manners; must needs worship him represented in a way far inferiour to his Majesty and Greatnes.

4. *Dr.* Stillingfleet *does worship God represented unto him, without the beatifical vision, either by his own thoughts and imaginations, or by the*

the words of others: Sure Dr. *Still.* will not confeſs himſelf to be ſo ill a Chriſtian, as to deny this Propoſition, and to ſay, that he never worſhips God: now, if he does worſhip God, he muſt needs worſhip him under the idea and repreſentation, which he frames in his mind of the Deity; for adoration neceſſarily ſuppoſes in the Perſon, that adores, an idea and apprehenſion of the object, which he adores. Whither therefore the idea, which Dr. *Stillingfleet* frames of the Deity, be drawn out of his own diſcourſes, or out of what he has read in Scripture, and other Books, or out of what he has heard from other men; he muſt needs adore and worſhip him under ſuch an idea and repreſentation, as he frames of him. Neither will Dr. *Still.* pretend, that he enjoys the beatifical viſion, as often as he worſhips God, and from thence infer, that the idea, which he frames of God, is nothing inferiour to the Greatnes and Majeſty of God: for that would be to enroll himſelf among the fanaticks and *alumbrado's*, againſt whom he inveighs with ſo great animoſity.

Out of theſe Propoſitions, either expreſly own'd by Dr. *Still.*, or ſo manifeſt of themſelves, that he cannot chuſe but aſſent unto them; I argue thus, to demonſtrate that he is an Idolater according to his own Conceſſions.

Whoever worſhips God repreſented in a way far inferiour to his greatneſs; is an Idolater: See Propoſit. 1. *But whoever worſhips God repreſented unto him without the beatifical Viſion, either by Images, by words, or by Imaginations, he worſhips God repreſented in a way far inferiour to his greatneſs*; See Propoſ. 3. *Ergo, whoever worſhips God repreſented unto him, without the beatifical viſion, either by Images, by words, or by Imaginations; is an Idolater:* The conſequence is good: *But* Dr. Stillingfleet *worſhips God repreſented unto him, without the beatifical viſion, either by the words of others, or by his own imaginations,* (for he deteſts all worſhip of God by Images) See Propoſ. 4. *Ergo, Dr.* Stillingfleet *is an Idolater:* The premiſes being granted, as they are by Dr. *Stillingfleet*, the conſequence cannot be deny'd.

Hence I infer, 1. That Dr. *Stillingfleet* according to his own Principles, does commit Idolatry, as often as he thinks upon God, or ſpeaks of him; for in all ſuch occaſions he frames a repreſentation of God far beneath him, and *unſuitable* to his greatnes, which in his opinion is flat Idolatry. Nay, I do not doubt, but that many Images and Pictures of God are as congruous a repreſentation of the Deity, as Dr. *Stillingfleet's* fancies or ideas: neither are Images or Pictures any other things than the objects of men's thoughts or words, cut out in Stone, or ſet down in colour.

2. That as often as Dr. *Stillingfleet* preaches of God, he provokes his Auditory, according to his own Principles, to Idolatry; no leſs, than if he did expoſe unto their ſight the Image of the Deity, with reſpect

respect to the worship of God thereby; which in his Tenets is a manifest provocation to Idolatry; the reason is, because not only by corporeal Images, but also by Dr. *Stillingfleet*'s Sermons, God is represented in a way unsuitable to his greatness, and infinitely beneath his nature.

3. That according to the same Maximes of Dr. *Stillingfleet*, not only the Prophets and Evangelists, who Penn'd the Scripture, but also the Holy Ghost, who dictated it unto them; are plain Idolaters: because they represent God in their writings, in a manner far beneath his greatnes; neither can he otherwise be represented by words, seeing his greatnes is inaffable.

Finally, I infer and conclude hence, how little account is to be made of the charge of Idolatry layed upon the *Roman* Church by Dr. *Stillingfleet*; seeing that the very same Principles, whereby he pretends to prove that *Roman* Catholicks are Idolaters, do prove, or they prove nothing, (as is most certain; for an argument that proves too much, proves nothing,) that the Prophets, the Evangelists, and the Holy Ghost, are Idolaters; and if in this main point of Idolatry, which he pretends to make manifest and undeniable against us, he does erre so sacrilegiously and so enormously; may we not prudently think, that the other charges of lesser moment, which he lays upon the *Roman* Church, and wherein he does not pretend to so great evidence; are meer whimsies and malicious calumnies!

These Papers had been set forth soon after the Publication of Dr. *Stillingfleet*'s Discourse, had it not been, 1. Because out of ambition to deal fairly with Dr. *Stillingfleet*, and to see, what he could say in his defence, I us'd all means possible, to have those syllogismes, which relate to the Idolatry charged upon us, convey'd into his hands; but all my endeavours were frustrated, some of them, whom I employ'd, not daring to present them unto him, others not finding him at home, others finding him taken up in other concerns. 2. Because after I had resolv'd to give them to the Press, I could not in a long time find any Printers, that would undergo the hazard of Printing them; such is the continual search, which is made of all Presses, especially in order to impede the publishing of any answer against Dr. *Stillingfleet*, which had they considered, who so freely censure our Doctors, as not being able to answer him; they would have past a more favourable sentence upon them: for by these two sheets any one may clearly see, that it is very easy to make answers against Dr. *Stillingfleet*, and that the difficulty only consists in Printing and Publishing them here in *England*.

By *John Williams*.

Plain, and ſhort RULES For *POINTING PERIODS*, AND *READING SENTENCES* Grammatically; with the great Uſe of them.

By *M. LEWIS* of *Tottenham.*

THE foundation of the *Syntactical* part of Grammar conſiſts in theſe two things: *To divide a Period into Sentences*; And *To read theſe Sentences Grammatically.* The Maſter builds upon the Sands without a baſis; and the Scholar learns by roat without reaſon, who doth not bottom here. I ſhall offer a few ſhort Rules to both theſe neceſſary things.

Rules for pointing a PERIOD.

EVery Subject, called the *Nominative Caſe*, and *Finite Verb* (expreſſed, or underſtood) with their Dependents, muſt have a Point, or diſtinction: becauſe the Verb expreſſes, the *ſtate*, *motion*, or *action* of the Subject, and muſt be ſtopt, or elſe we move in *infinitum*, and cannot begin a new motion. Let this Paragraph be an example.

Except, 1, any word, or clauſe (having the import of a Sentence) wherein a *Verb* is virtually contained, may have a ſtop. Such are,

1. *Interjections.* As, *Alas*, that is, *it is a ſad caſe, woe is me.*
2. *Participles* of the *preſent*, and *preter-tenſe.* As, *God, creating the World, made man. Man, created by God, was placed in Paradiſe.*
3. One *Subſtantive* after another by *appoſition*, having the import of a Sentence. As, *Man, the image of God, was placed in Paradiſe*; otherwiſe not. As, *M. T. C.*
4. An *Infinitive mood*, having the import of a Sentence, may be diſtinguiſhed from the preceding Verb. As, *God created man in his image, to be lord of the Creatures*, that is, *that he might be lord of the Creatures.* But, when the *Infinitive mood*, hath the nature of a *Subſtantive*, and depends upon the former Verb, as if it was an *oblique Caſe*, it ought not to be diſtinguiſhed. As, *I deſire to learn*, that is, *I deſire learning.*

2. Except the *Vocative caſe* with the *dependents*, which is an extraſentential phraſe, and a preparation to a motion. As, *Son, come hither.*

3. Except, when a *Word*, or *Phraſe*, as in *Zeugma*, relates to ſeveral things, it may be diſtinguiſhed from the thing, immediately depending upon it, to ſhew its relation to be indifferent, to that, and to the things, it affects more remotely. As, *God hath given a law, to the fire, air, water, earth.*

4. When a Sentence is parted by any intercepting *Clauſe*, the *former* part of the Sentence is diſtinguiſhed from the Clauſe, and the Clauſe from the *latter* part of the Sentence. As, *God, creating the world, gave man dominion over the Creatures.*

5. The ſame *Sentence* ſometimes hath a Point in it, when it is in-grammatically placed, to ſhew its diſorder. As, *By an almighty power, God created the world.*

I do not intend, a Point *muſt* be made in all theſe caſes. I only ſay, a Point *may* be, and *de facto* many times is, upon theſe grounds. Exact Pointing is beſt. But if we do miſcarry, it is better to under point, then over point.

Theſe things are obvious to ordinary capacities, and do fully anſwer my end: to prepare *Engliſh* to be rendered into Latin; and *Latin* to be Analyſed, and rendered into Engliſh: and therein are uſeful to Children.

But as a *Point* in general is abſolutely neceſſary to rational inſtructing in the plain *Syntactical* part of Grammar: ſo to underſtand the kinds of Points, when, and where they ſhall be uſed, is as neceſſary to ſome parts of *Rhetorick.* No man can pronounce, and act Artificially out of judgment; or compoſe Orationally by a Rule, who doth not underſtand the various conſtitutions, and contextures of *Periods*, from whence the kinds of Points do ariſe.

As therefore a *Point* in general arises from a *Verb* in general, or something *analogous* to it: so the *species* of Points arise from the *Verbs* in a Period, as they do more intimately; or more remotely relate to one another. Where the dependence is greater, the stay between them is less; (giving liberty for a lower tone, and lesser action) where the dependance is less, the stay is greater, the tone higher, and the action more.

The Points, distinguishing a plain Sentence, are, a *Period*, a *Colon*, a *Sub-colon*, a *Comma*, which may be compared to those stops in Musick, a *Minim*, a *Crochet*, a *Quaver*, a *Semi-quaver*.

To the Rules following I premise. A Proposition, Theme, or Matter treated of is either *Simple*; (As *God created the World. Man is lord of the Creatures*) or it is *Compounded*, in which there is a principal Verb, expressed, or suppressed, and another Verb, or Verbs depending upon it, to explain, enlarge, restrain, divide, or confirm the principal Proposition laid down, to which these depending Verbs are united by some Conjunction, expressed, or understood. Let this Paragraph be an example. The principal Sentence suppressed is, *Propositions are twofold*. All, that follows, relates to this.

The principal *Verb* in a Period is that, which is the *motion* of the principal subject; or doth affect the principal *Object*, spoken of. This *Verb* (if it be expressed) is the first Verb in the Natural, and Grammatical order. But it is often suppressed, as in the former Paragraph, proposed for an example.

The principal *Theme*, or *Matter* is threefold: 1. Of a *Discourse*, or an *Oration*; 2. Of a *Paragraph*, usually noted by a Break; 3. Of a *Period* strictly taken.

A *Discourse* may contain several Paragraphs. A *Paragraph* may contain several Periods. Every one of these *Periods* have a principal *Verb*, that is, such a Verb, that doth not immediately depend upon another Verb, or *totum*. But it may depend upon the *Theme* of the Discourse, or Paragraph.

This all must grant, a great member, or *totum* in a *Period* is distinguished from lesser members, or parts by a greater rest, then lesser members are distinguished from one another, or from their subdividing members, and *exegetical* expressions. I mean: a *totum* is distinguished from its parts by a *Colon*; the *parts* are distinguished from one another by a *Sub-colon*; *Exegetical* expressions to these, are distinguished by *Comma's*.

Rules for a PERIOD.

A *Period* terminates Sense, that is absolute, full, and perfect.

And so it terminates: either one Sentence, or *categorical* Proposition; (As, *God created the World. Man is lord of the Creatures.*) Or it terminates more Sentences, distinguished by lesser Points: for the principal motion ought to have a greater rest, than the less principal. Any Paragraph in this discourse is an Example.

Rules for a COLON.

A *Colon* distinguishes Sentences, that are a *protasis*, and an *apodosis*; a *Proposition*, and the *reason*; a *similitude*, and the *application*; a *totum*, and its *members*. As, *God alone could create the World: because he is Omnipotent.* As *God hath created the World: so he preserves it. Living Creatures are of two sorts: Men; and Bruits.*

A *Colon* is likewise used, when Sentences seem *absolute* (but are not): because the *totum* is, either remote, or suppressed. As, *The Flint strikes fire: the Load-stone draws Iron: the Touch-stone tries Mettals: the Pumice-stone smooths rough things.* The *totum* suppressed, is this, *Stones serve for divers uses.* If this *totum* was expressed, it should be distinguished from the parts by a *colon*, and these Sentences, or parts from one another by a *sub-colon*.

The Rule of a Sub-COLON.

A *Sub-colon* is used to distinguish *membra dividentia* in a large sense, which are *opposites*, or at least *disparates*. As, *Angels are good; or bad.*

This *totum* is often suppressed, and many times defer'd to the close of the Period.

Rules for a COMMA.

A *Comma* is used to distinguish Sentences, that have a nearer relation one to another, and a greater dependencie one upon another, then *membra dividentia* have. Such are: 1. *Membra subdividentia*; Sentences united by any Conjunction, that do not come under any of the three former Rules; the *Vocative* Case; and *Interjections*.

2. *Exegetical*

2. *Exegetical* expreſſions; Subſtantives by appoſition; the *Infinitive* mood; tranſpoſed, or intercepting Clauſes, and ſuch like. Theſe, if we would be accurate, ought to be diſtinguiſhed by a leſſer note then a Comma, if we had any ſuch: becauſe theſe have a nearer relation one to another, then thoſe under the former head. This whole diſcourſe may be an Example.

Enumerations are many times ſo Oratorically digeſted by pairs, that they ſeem to be *membra dividentia*, but are not. As, *I am perſwaded, that neither life, nor death, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things preſent, nor things to come*, &c.

If the Caſe be ſo nice, that you cannot determine, whether there is only an *enumeration*; or the Clauſes are *membra dividentia*, uſe ſuch a diſtinction, as will make the ſenſe moſt plain, with reſpect to the points above, and below.

Theſe are all the ordinary *Points* Grammarians have aſſigned, but are too few, as appears by the Rules for a Comma, and may be further illuſtrated by this example following, where there is the *totum* diſtinguiſhed from its members by a Colon; the principal *membra dividentia* by a ſub-Colon; the *membra ſubdividentia* by a Comma; laſtly you have *exegetical* expreſſions, diſtinguiſhed by *ſub-Comma's*, if there was ſuch a Point. I preſume to add it, and aſſign it this Character (,). As, *God created the world: firſt the Heavens, where there is the Sun, the fountain of light, the Moon, borrowing her light from the Sun, the Stars, varying their magnitudes; the earth, containing the Sea, the confluence of water, the dry land, ſupporting living Creatures*: Here you ſee we are neceſſitated to uſe a ſub-Comma, or to uſe a Comma promiſcuouſly: Therefore in all caſes, that you may be diſtinct, begin with as *great* a Point, as the compaſs of your Period will bear. In ſome caſes it is tollerable to ſet the Point a note, or two too high, though beſides the Rule: becauſe the ſub-diviſions (being numerous) are more ſubject to confuſion, and the end of Points is, to make the Period diſtinct in its parts; and intelligible in its ſenſe. As, *God created this great, and wide abyſs, which we call the World, and all the parts of it: and firſt the Heavens. where we have the higheſt, or third heaven, the bleſſed abode of Saints, and Angels: then the heaven, or firmament: in which we behold the Sun, the fountain of light, and heat; the Moon, the governeſs of moiſt things, borrowing her light from the Sun; the Stars, and Planets, differing in magnitude, light, and influence from each other. Then ſecondly this terraqueous Orb, we call the Earth. where is the Sea, the confluence of waters, and habitation of Fiſhes: and dry land, the houſe and nurſe of men, and beaſts. Laſtly, there is the Airy region in which the birds do play, and ſport themſelves, and without which no breathing Animal can live.* In this diſcourſe you have *three* ſorts of Periods: the *firſt* is *periodus pendens*, ſet above the line; the *two* next are *periodi mediæ*, ſet in the line; the *laſt* is *periodus ſupina* ſet below the line. You have alſo Comma's and ſub-Comma's, and all little enough. Such a caſe as this is, ſeldome occurs. The greater members are diſtinguiſhed from the leſſer, the leſſer from the leaſt by proportionable ſtops.

Doubtleſs a *ſub-Comma* would be of great uſe in ſuch Periods, as this, and to diſtinguiſh Sentences that are under the *ſecond* head for a Comma. I could heartily wiſh ſome perſons, of authority in the world, would aſſert it.

As a key to this whole diſcourſe, I only beg ſome point to be certain (I do not much matter which) from which all the other Points may take their compaſs. As in Ringing four Bells, the ſecond is uſually made (and therefore called) the certain, according to the motion of which, the little Bell below, and the greater Bells above, do riſe, fall, or keep their pitch: So I would chooſe a ſub-Colon certain, and to be uſed only to diſtinguiſh *membra dividentia* in ordinary caſes, i.e. Clauſes that are *oppoſit*, or *diſparate*. What ever Sentences (as in the Rules for a Comma) are below this, ſhall be Comma'd; what ever are above it, ſhall be Colon'd. Abſolute Sentences ſhall terminate in a Full point ordinarily. In extraordinary caſes, extraordinary courſes muſt be taken, as in the laſt Example.

I purpoſely omit to ſay any thing of *other* Points; becauſe many Grammarians have ſpoken plainly enough to them.

I offer theſe Rules only as an *Eſſay*, ſubmitting them to better Judgments. I hope, by an accurate obſervation of all contextures, they may be made more perfect.

I proceed to *Rules* directing to read Grammatically: becauſe neither Sentences; nor

Periods can be rightly distinguished, unless the Natural, and Grammatical order of them be first apprehended. *Rules for reading Grammatically.*

R. 1. EVery Sentence consisteth of a *Substantive*, called the Nominative Case, and a *Verb* (expressed, or understood) with their Dependents. The *Dependents* of the Verb are those words, which it affects with its motion mediately; or immediately.

Except a *Vocative Case*, and any word, or clause, having the import of a Sentence, where the Verb is virtually. These are sometimes *Conjunctions*, *Interjections*, *Participles* of the *present*, and *pretertense*, one *Substantive* after another by *apposition*, the *Infinitive Mood*, &c. with their Dependents. You have Examples for these in the general Rules for Pointing.

R. 2. The *Nominative Case* begins the Sentence, with which the Verb agrees.

Except, a *Conjunction*, the *oblique* Cases of *Relatives*, *Interrogatives*, or *Partitives* do begin the Sentence. As, *What book dost thou read? Thou didst meet with my brother, whom thou didst salute, he will direct, what Book I shall read.*

R. 3. The *Nominative case* stands before the Verb.

Except, it stands after the Verb to distinguish Demanding, and Commanding from Shewing. As, *I quest thou? dost thou love? let a man love. Love thou.*

Except, *Nor*, *neither*, or *there* do go before the Verb. As, *Neither can I learn, how there came a man into my house.*

R. 4. The *Nominative case* stands immediately before the Verb.

Except, a *Genitive case*, or a *Gerund* in *Di*, analogous to a Genitive case, do come between. As, *The lord of the Creatures was made after God's image.*

An *Adjective*, governing a Case, a *Participle*, a *Relative*, a *Conjunction* with their Dependents, may part the Nominative case and Verb. As, *A man doth labour*, may be thus parted. *A man desirous of honour, desiring honour, which doth desire honour, if he doth desire honour, doth labour.*

These Clauses may be placed after the Verb. As, *A man doth labour, if he doth desire honour.*

R. 5. Every *Adjective* may have a *Substantive* after it, with which it doth agree.

Except, *Participles*, and *Adjectives*, governing Cases, have their *Substantives* before them. As, *God creating man*, &c. *A man desirous of honour.*

R. 6. Every *Verb* may have a sign of a *Mood*, or *Tense*.

Except the Verb is a sign of a Mood, or Tense; or do follow a Verb, that is the sign of a *Mood*, or *Tense*. As, *God alone can create.*

R. 7. Every *Substantive* may have a sign of a Case, by which it is governed.

Except, 1. *Pronoun Substantives* in the Accusative case. As, *Me, us, thee you, him, her, it, them*, which will not admit a general Sign.

2. Except, 1. The *Substantive* coming after *Dignus, indignus, opus*, and *usus* signifying need. 2. After Verbals in *Bilis*, and Passive Participles. 3. After Verbs of Comparing, being angry with, to meet with. 4. The word coming after Verbs of *Esteeming*. 5. Proper names of Lesser places, and *Humi, domi, militiæ, belli*. 6. The word coming after *Satago, miseror misereſco*. 7. After *Interest* and *refert*. 8. After Verbs of *wanting*, and *potior*. 9. After *Fungor, fruor, utor*. 10. After certain Verbs signifying *profit, disprofit*, &c. where *TO* is implyed. 11. *Apposition*. 12. The *Ablative Case* absolute. 13. The word of *Price*.

These *Rules* for *Pointing*, and *Reading*, primarily intended for the *English* Tongue, are applicable to other Languages with a little alloy.

When we understand these Rules, and can decline *Nouns*, and form *Verbs*, there remains only the *Propria quæ maribus*, *As in præsenti*, and the *Syntax*, which are made thus short, and plain.

First, The *Propria quæ maribus* is reduced to five special Rules thus:

1. All *Nouns* of the first, and fifth Declension are of the *Feminine* Gender.
2. All *Nouns* of the second, and fourth Declension are of the *Masculine* Gender.
3. All *Nouns* of the third Declension ending in *An, in, on, o er, or, os*, are *Masculine*.
4. All *Nouns* of the third Declension in *x* and *s*, are the *Feminine*.
5. All *Nouns* of the third Declension in *us*, &c. are *Neuter*.

A few Exceptions will perfect these Rules. Secondly

Secondly, The *As in præsenti* is reduced to three Rules.

1. All Verbs in *O* impure are of the first Conjugation, and do make *Avi* in the Preterperfect tense, and *Atum* in the Supine.
2. All Verbs in *Eo* are of the second Conjugation, and do make *ui*, and *itum*.
3. All Verbs in *Io* are of the fourth Conjugation, and make *Ivi*, and *itum*.

All Verbs of the third Conjugation are enumerated. All *Irregular* Verbs of the first, second, and fourth Conjugation are also enumerated, and ought to be learnt by Beginners, as a *Vocabulary*: because they are generally Primatives, and words of most frequent use.

Thirdly, The *Syntax* is reduced to three Rules, according to the number of words declined, and are all contained in the Rules for reading Grammatically.

1. Every Verb hath Number, and Person by the *Nominative Case*, which is a *Substantive* placed before it: because the Verb is not determined in these.
2. Every *Adjective* hath Number, Case, and Gender by the *Substantive* following. This comprehends the *Antecedent* and *Relative*. The Adjective is not determined.
3. Every other *Substantive* is governed of the word before it, on which it depends, according to the Sign of the Case.

These Signs are *Of, to, for, with, from, by, then, in, at, a, the,* which two last are onely general Signs.

The Hress of the Syntax *lies in these Rules for the government of the* Substantive. *How easy it is by the Signs of Cases in comparison of* Lilly's *Rules, founded upon the signification, or enumeration of the preceding Word (being in number* Fifteen score *) will appear by the following comparison.*

LILLIES Rules. | R. *by the signs of Cases.*

1. *Quum duo Substantiva.* 2. *Adjectivum in Neutro genere.*
3. *Laus & vituperium rei.* } A Genitive is true *Latin.*
4. *Adjectiva qua ad copiam.* } An Ablative more elegant.
5. *Adjectiva qua desiderium.* 6. *Adjectiva verbalia in* AX.
7. *Nomina Partitiva.* 8. *Comparativa & Superlativa.*
9. *Sum Genitivum postulat.* 10. *Verba accusandi.*
11. *His impersonalibus permitet.* 12. *Participiorum voces.*
13. *Quadam adverbia loci.*

Of after a Substantive or Adjective is a sign of the Genitive Case. As, *The love of Mony, Desirous of Mony.*

1. *Passivis additur Ablativus.* 2. *Quadam accipiendi.*
3. *Mæreor cum Adverbiis.* 4. *Diversa verbis implendi, & onerandi.*
5. *Verbum impersonale passiva vocis.* 6. *Vapulo, veneo, liceo.*

Of after a Verb is made by a Preposition. *He is praised of the Mr.*

1. *Adjectiva quibus commodum.* 2. *Huc referuntur nomina.*
3. Opus *adjective pro necessarius.* 4. *Numeralia in alio sensu.*
5. *Nomina diversitatis.* 6. *Exosus & perosus.*
7. *Omnia verba acquisitive.* 8. *Verba significantia Commodum.*
9. *Verba Comparandi.* 10. *Verba dandi.* 11. *Verba promittendi.*
12. *Verba fidendi.* 13. *Verba imperandi, & nuntiandi.*
14. *Verba obsequendi.* 15. *Verba minandi.* 16. *Sum cum compositis.*
17. *Verba composita cum* præ, ad.

This is an uncertain Rule. *Mutant Dativum aliquoties in alium casum.* It is according to the Sign usually, when that fails, Anthority is the best Rule.

18. *Est pro habeo.* 19. *Huic confine est suppetit.*
20. *Sum cum compositis.* 21. *In dativum feruntur hæc.*
22. *Quadam adverbia.* 23. *Est etiam ubi in Dativum.*

To before a Substantive, and *For*, are signs of a Dative.

For is sometimes made by a Preposition, Hard to be determined by a Beginner.

For, the Cause, is alwaies the Ablative. *Do tibi, pignori* [pro *pignore*], *causâ honoris.*

1. *His vero attinet, pertinet,* &c. 2. *Ex his quadam efferuntur.*
3. *Quadam variam habent constructionem.* 4. *Nomina appellativa.*
5. *Verbis significantibus motum ad locum.*
6. *Ad hunc modum utimur* Rus.

After *attinet, pertinet, spectat, loquor, hortor, invito provoco, addo, voco,* and words of Motion, To is made by *Ad. Ambulo* ad *templum.*

7. Except

To before a Verb is a sign of the Infinitive Mood Active. *Cupio amare.*

1. Except after Substantives and Adjectives governing a Genitive Case, To is made by a Gerund in *Di*, *Tempus amandi.*
2. After *aptus, paratus, tardus*, and Verbs of Exhorting, exciting, and prevailing, a Gerund in *Dum*. *Aptus ad amandum.*
3. *About* To is the Future in *Rus*. *Amaturus.*
4. After words of Motion, the first Supine. *Venit amatum.*

To *be* is the Infinitive Mood Passive. *Cupit amari.*

Except, 1. After Verbs Substantives, and Noun Substantives, the Future in *Dus*. *Est homo amandus.*
2. After certain Adjectives, *easy, hard, worthy, unworthy*, &c. The latter Supine, *facilis amatu.*
There are not Rules found in *Lilly*'s Syntax to answer these, except those two, *prius Supinum*, and *posterius* Supinum.

With, and *by* the Cause, or Manner, and after Comparatives and Superl. is a sign of the *Abl.*

1. *Adjectiva regunt ablativum.* 2. *Forma vel modus rei.*
3. *Praditus contentus.* 4. *Verba abundandi.*
5. *Quodvis verbum*, &c. 6. *Adverbia diversitatis.*
7. *Tanto, quanto.*

From is made by a Preposition, expressed, or understood.

1. *Nomina diversitatis.* 2. *Numeralia in alio sensu.*
3. *Natus, prognatus.* 4. *Diversa verbis implendi.*
5. *Verbis significantibus motum à loco.*
6. *Ad eundem modum usurpatur.*

In, or *At*, a Preposition.

1. *Nomina appellativa.* 2. *Quibuslibet verbis subjicitur.*
3. *Qua significant partem.* 4. *Verum si proprium nomen loci.*

A, or *The*, which are not particular signs, or no signs at all, shall be the Accusative. *Do vestem. Deus amat hominem.*

1. *Verba transitiva.* 2. *Quin etiam verba intransitiva.*
3. *Hac impersonalia accusandi.* 4. *His impersonalibus subjicitur.*
5. *Qua autem durationem.* 6. *Magnitudinis mensura.*
7. *Ex his quadam efferuntur.*
8. *Quadam variam habent constructionem.* The variety is according to the Sign.
9. *Spatium loci*, &c.
10. *Adverbia accusandi casum admittunt.*
11. *En, ecce*, and *cedo* govern an Accusative Case, and are not *Adverbs*, but defective *Verbs.*

Hunc Accusativum mutant authores, &c.
Ingens praterea adjectivorum turba nullis obstricta regulis, &c.

These mutations are determined by the signs of Cases, commonly.

A Participle of the Present tense, having a sign of a Genitive Case, is a Gerund in *Di*. *Time of loving. Tempus amandi.*

A Participle of the Present tense, having a sign of an Ablative Case, is a Gerund in *Do*. *Hindred in loving. Impeditus amando.*

Consider how obscure *Lilly*'s Rules are for Gerunds.

I have on purpose omitted the Exceptions: because they just balance one another, and are enumerated in the Rules for reading Grammatically, with which you may compare *Lillies* Grammar.

If the Scholar should be instructed only in the Rules for Signs of Cases, and never be troubled with more then three Exceptions, he might be easily perfected in all the rest by Examples, it may be, better then by Rules.

By this Grammar, one, that hath lost his *Latin* Tongue, may in a few daies, after many years discontinuance, recover the Grammar of it, though he never had any perfection in it. This I have often tried, and am ready again to demonstrate.

Consider

1. Consider, If you peruse *Lillies* Grammar, Whether all the fundamental Rules, necessary for a Beginner to learn, are not comprehended under these few Rules by the Signs of Cases? The Rules for Elegancy are of a second consideration, and many variations from the Signs of Cases are *Grecisms*, and so will aptly fall in with the *Greek* Tongue, the Syntax of which is accommodated to this method.

2. Consider, Whether by this *Syntax* it is not easy to begin to Make *Latin*, before we begin to Perse, as *Lilly* directs in his Preface to his Grammar? There being no more in the government of Substantives to be considered, then what sign the Substantive hath: If it hath no particular sign, it must be the Accusative Case; or if it have a sign, it is made according to that sign.

3. Consider, Whether the impossibiry of using *Lillies* Syntax is not the reason, why all neglect *Lillies* Directions, to Make *Latin*, before they begin to Perse?

4. Consider, Whether those, that learn *Lillies* Syntax, do not get the Tongue meerly by habit, burdened with a huge fardle of useless Rules; or at the best, they make their *Latin* at first by signs of Cases (nor allowed for Rules) till they have got the habit?

5. Consider, Whether this is not the reason, that all men do forget their Grammar, as soon as they have got the Tongue: because the Grammar, as to the *Syntax*, being of no use in getting the *Lingua*, is of no use in keeping it, neither can it be of any use in recovering it, when once lost: because we do not learn the Tongue by the Rule, but by a frequent application of numerous Examples to the Rules, we come to understand them, and that principally by the Signs.

6. Consider, Whether *Lillies* Rules understood exclusively (as most apprehend them) are not false? Most words do govern other Cases, then those the Rules assign, and yet direction is seldome given (such as a Child can understand) when they have those other Cases.

7. Consider, If the Rules be understood inclusively (as *Lilly* intends) *Eidem verbo diversi casus diversâ ratione apponi possunt.* Whether the Rules are not then impracticable: because to understand this *diversa ratio*, it is necessary to have *three hundred* words enumerated, and Rules so perfect, as to see them, as it were, at one look, which is impossible for one of ordinary parts to do, and then the whole *Syntax* falls to the ground.

Those that think this may be done, let them make a tryal themselves upon that Rule in the *Greek* Grammar, *Verba incipiendi, desinendi, appetendi, amandi*, &c. where there are but twenty heads enumerated. If Verbs named cannot be reduced readily and judiciously by a man to these twenty, how shall a Child do with fifteen times so many?

Thus the *Rules* of Grammar (so much contended about) are made plain, and short. A little Grammar will serve the turn, where the Tongue learnt, is constantly spoken, and exercised diligently.

Comenius hath prescribed a Method for the gaining the *Copia Verborum*, beyond what I have seen.

His *Vestibulum*, and *Orbis pictus* contain the primitive words.

His Lexicon *Januale* teaches to Decline Derivatives from their Primitives.

His *Janua* comprehends Primitives, and Derivatives in their proper signification.

His *Atrium* teaches the *Elegancy*, and *Idiom* of the Tongue.

The advantage, a Scholar shall have from this Method, will be this:

1. From the *Janua*, perfectly learnt in *Latin*, and *Greek*, any other Languages may be quickly attained;
2. Things may be learnt with Words by shewing the things themselves from Repositories, by using *Maps*, and *Globes*, and *Pictures*, where the things themselves cannot be had; or the things may be described (as the Learner is capable). This will make *Learning* pleasant.

Doubtless one thus Instructed in the knowledge of things, and initiated in all Arts, and Sciences (especially in *Arithmetick*, and *Geometry*) is like to make a better progress, when he is advanced to the University; or probably will be a wiser man, when he is otherwaies disposed of in the world, then another, who learns only

Appellatives

[illegible] but knows nothing of things: seeing he hath laid [illegible] of real knowledge; and will improve it by his daily converse in the [illegible]

[illegible] School may be made *Ludus literarius*, by a prudent use of School-mony; *Those, that are diligent, will have most Mony; Those, that have most mony, shall have most [illegible]; The most honourable, shall have most liberty for Play.* This is certain, If Children can be made diligent, they will imprint things in their memories as fast as men. [illegible] wales proposed (without any severity, unless in cases of contempt) will certainly effect it.

They may be also diverted by Bodily exercises, as, *Dauncing, Fencing, Vaulting, Riding*, which give a graceful garb, and increase bodily strength.

They may be incouraged, as their *Genius* shall lead them. In *Painting, Limning, Etching, Turning*, and such like Devices.

Those, that desire to see more of this Subject, may consult a Grammar, *and an* Apology, *composed by* M. Lewis, *and sold by* Tho. Parkhurst *at the* Bible *and* Three Crowns *in* Cheapside, *and by* M. Million *at the* Bible *in* Fleet-street; *or they may be further satisfied by the Author, upon any* Thursday *at three of the Clock in the After-noon, at the* Tun *and* Bolt *in* Fleet-street. *Who undertakes to perfect any Person, that will attend him there, in a few daies, in the plain part of* Grammar; *and in a few hours, in the exact skill of* Pointing.

At Tottenham High-Cross *there is a* GYMNASIUM *Erecting, where any Person Young or Old, as their Quality is, may be perfected in* Grammar *according to this Method, and in the* Tongues *by constant conversation, and may also be instructed in* Experimental Philosophy *by* Visibles, *in* History, Rhetorick, Musick, Bodily exercises, Painting, *The* Mathematicks, *As* Astronomy, Geography, Geometry, Arithmetick, Fair Writing, *in a short and compendious Method, as may further appear by the* Grammar *and* Apology, *before spoken of.*

POSTSCRIPT.

Take a Scheme for Pointing *thus. So many* finite Verbs *there are in any discourse, so many* stops *must be made, and no more, unless by accident. So many* principal Verbs, *so many* principal points *or Periods. A* Period *is either* Supina; *or* Pendens: *for Periods may have the same respect one to another, as depending Clauses, as appears by the resolving of* Periods *into Clauses, and* Clauses *into Periods. As,* Mans excellency consists in his Soul, and Body. The Soul commands, the Body obeys. In this we are like to God, in that to Beasts. *It resolves thus.* Our excellency consists, either in our Souls, by which we command like God; or Bodies, with which we work like Bruits.

So many depending Verbs, so many depending Points: as a protasis, *and* apodosis *is distinguished by a* Colon; membra dividentia *by a* sub-Colon; *Sentences united by a Conjunction, which are not* membra dividentia, *are distinguished by a* Comma; *Exegetical expressions, the Infinitive Mood, intercepting Clauses, occasion a* sub-Comma, *if such a distinction might be granted, and may be marked by a streight line, thus* (;). *Let this* Postscript *be a* praxis *for* Pointing.

ROY. SOC.
SOLD